1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) NO. CV-09-00333-JPH
Plaintiff,) ORDER ADOPTING REPORT) AND RECOMMENDATION
VS.)
WILLIAM M. LARSEN,)
Defendant.)
)

BEFORE THE COURT for resolution is the Report and Recommendation entered on March 16, 2010 (Ct. Rec. 12), recommending that the stipulated motion to approve consent judgment (Ct. Rec. 10) be granted. On March 25, 2010, Mr. Larsen timely filed a letter construed as an objection (Ct. Rec. 13).

Defendant alleges he should not have to repay the student loan that is the subject of this litigation because the school he was attending abruptly shut down and did not reopen due to fraud and other problems (Ct. Rec. 13 at 1-2). Mr. Larsen argues at the very least he should not be responsible for repaying interest on the loan (Ct. Rec. 13 at 2). Plaintiff has not responded to Mr. Larsen's objections.

Mr. Larsen does not indicate why he objected after he signed the stipulation for entry of consent judgment on March 16, 2010 (Ct. Rec. 11). Unfortunately for Mr. Larsen, even if the Court assumes for the sake of argument his objection has been preserved and is

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

1 2

factually correct, it does not provide a valid defense to his obligation to this plaintiff. See Crawford v. American Institute of Professional Careers, Inc., 934 F.Supp. 335, 340-341 (D. Ar. 1996) (borrower raises as a defense against loan payment school's alleged misrepresentation but his state law claim is pre-empted by the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA), citing 20 U.S.C.A. § 1087-1(e)(2)(D)(West Supp. 1996); Chae v. SLM Corporation, 593 F.3d 936, 943, 945-946,950 (9th Cir. 2010)(borrower's state claims of breach of contract are pre-empted by the Federal Family Education Loan

The Court sympathizes with Mr. Larsen but his objection is without legal merit. Having reviewed the report and recommendation, the Court adopts the magistrate judge's report and recommendation in its entirety.

Program of the HEA, now at 20 U.S.C. §§ 1001-1155).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (Ct. Rec. 12) to grant the stipulated motion to approve entry of consent judgment is ADOPTED in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Executive is directed to enter this Order and an Order of Judgment, forward copies to counsel for plaintiff and to defendant, and close the file.

DATED this 15th day of April, 2010.

s/Lonny R. Suko

LONNY R. SUKO
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE